



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,146	11/25/2003	Hue Scott Snowden	19076A	9253
23556	7590	06/16/2010		
KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC. Tara Pohlkotte 2300 Winchester Rd. NEENAH, WI 54956			EXAMINER	
			FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,146	Applicant(s) SNOWDEN ET AL.
	Examiner William P. Fletcher III	Art Unit 1715

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,3,8-10,16-24,26,27 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,3,8-10,16-24,26,27 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 April 2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. The language of claim 36, as amended, does not strictly require that the anti-static agent and the monovalent salt be different compounds. Rather, prior art teaching a monovalent salt anti-static agent would read on the claim, as amended, provided the concentration of said salt were less than about 0.05 wt.-%, since the now-claimed concentration of *less than about 0.10 weight percent of a monovalent salt* is inclusive of a concentration of less than about 0.05 wt.-%. As stated in the prior Office action, the concentration of monovalent salt anti-static agent taught by Baldwin is merely exemplary and there is no teaching away from utilizing quantities outside of the range of 0.2-0.5 wt.-%. Specifically, Baldwin teaches that the "salt...when present in the finish accepts moisture from the surrounding atmosphere and readily ionizes, thus enhancing the antistatic

properties of the fabric. The required amount of salt is dissolved in water then added to the bath" [5:19-23]. It is clear that the amount of salt added to the composition can be any amount required to achieve a desired level of static dissipation. Consequently, optimizing the concentration of monovalent salt in either direction, up or down, from the exemplary concentration of 0.2-0.5 wt.-%, in order to give the desired degree of anti-static property, would have been readily obvious to one skilled in the art as detailed in prior Office actions.

B. Claim 36 has been further amended to recite subsequent application of a *second treatment solution comprising an antistatic agent*. This newly-added language does exclude the application of the second solution's being a repeat application of the first solution. It has been established in the record, in the Office action mailed 15 November 2007, at the top of page 4, that repeated application of a coating composition to build up a layer of a desired thickness is well known in the art. In such an obvious arrangement, application of one layer followed by another, reads on the claimed application of a first and a second treatment solution containing an anti-stat.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 2, 3, 8, 16-24, 26, 27, and 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin (US 4,411,928 A) in view of Coates (US 4,028,887 A).

A. Baldwin and Coates are applied herein again as set forth in prior Office actions.

B. The language of claim 36, as amended, does not strictly require that the anti-static agent and the monovalent salt be different compounds. Rather, prior art teaching a monovalent salt anti-static agent would read on the claim, as amended, provided the concentration of said salt were less than about 0.05 wt.-%, since the now-claimed concentration of *less than about 0.10 weight percent of a monovalent salt* is inclusive of a concentration of less than about 0.05 wt.-%. As stated in the prior Office action, the concentration of monovalent salt anti-static agent taught by Baldwin is merely exemplary and there is no teaching away from utilizing quantities outside of the range of 0.2-0.5 wt.-%. Specifically, Baldwin teaches that the "salt...when present in the finish accepts moisture from the surrounding atmosphere and readily ionizes, thus enhancing the antistatic properties of the fabric. The required amount of salt is dissolved in water then added to the bath" [5:19-23]. It is clear that the amount of salt added to the

composition can be any amount required to achieve a desired level of static dissipation. Consequently, optimizing the concentration of monovalent salt in either direction, up or down, from the exemplary concentration of 0.2-0.5 wt.-%, in order to give the desired degree of anti-static property, would have been readily obvious to one skilled in the art as detailed in prior Office actions.

B. Claim 36 has been further amended to recite subsequent application of a *second treatment solution comprising an antistatic agent*. This newly-added language does exclude the application of the second solution's being a repeat application of the first solution. It has been established in the record, in the Office action mailed 15 November 2007, at the top of page 4, that repeated application of a coating composition to build up a layer of a desired thickness is well known in the art. In such an obvious arrangement, application of one layer followed by another, reads on the claimed application of a first and a second treatment solution containing an anti-stat.

6. Claims 9 and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin (US 4,411,928 A) in view of Coates (US 4,028,887 A), as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Potts (US 5,145,727 A).

A. Baldwin and Coates are applied herein again as set forth above.
B. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Baldwin and Coates so as to utilize, as the non-woven substrate, an S/M/S laminate, as noted in the prior Office actions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571) 272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Sunday, 5:00 AM - 12:00 PM and Monday through Friday, 5:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Phillip Fletcher III/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

14 June 2010